DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 474 VT 012 560

AUTHOR	Steed, Allen Terry
TITLE	Vocational Education Programs for Special Needs Students in Secondary Schools of Mississippi.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, State College.
REPORT NO	ES-10-R-37
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Improvement, Program Attitudes, *Program Descriptions, Secondary Schools, *State Programs, Teacher Attitudes, *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Mississippi

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to: (1) describe existing programs for special needs students, (2) provide information on students and teachers in these programs, (3) compare teacher and administrator appraisal of the programs, and (4) determine the degree of program acceptance by students, parents, and the public. Questionnaires and interviews revealed the views of teachers, administrators, and students in 46 Mississippi secondary schools offering special needs programs in vocational education. Self-appraisal of the programs disclosed several shortcomings: (1) lack of orientation programs, (2) inadequate preparation of administrators and teachers, (3) lack of participation by other teachers and guidance personnel, and (4) insufficient equipment and teaching materials. The report should provide vocational educators and administrators with information useful in the decision making process, resource allocation, program planning and implementation, and staff selection and training. (BH)

ED0 48474

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MISSISSIPPI

Allen Terry Steed

VT012560

Report 37

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on the ground of race, color, or national origin.

ED 048474

Report 37
Education Series 10

September, 1970

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MISSISSIPPI

By

Allen Terry Steed

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational-Technical Education
Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Social Science Research Center (SSRC) at Mississippi State University supports various projects in its program of research in OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT. Each of these projects is focused upon the derivation of information that will be useful in the development of human resources. Information derived thus far in this research program is included in the following publications:

1. INFLUENTIAL FACTORS CONCERNING HUMAN RESOURCES IN MISSISSIPPI, by James E. Wall. Preliminary Report 11, Education Series 1.

2. RESEARCH IN HOME ECONOMICS GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT: FIVE PILOT PROJECTS IN MISSISSIPPI -- 1965-66, by Mildred R. Witt and James E. Wall. Preliminary Report 15, Education Series 2.

3. EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND COMPETENCY NEEDS IN NONFARM AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS IN MISSISSIPPI, by James E. Wall, Obed L. Snowden, and A. G. Shepherd, Jr. Preliminary Report 16, Education Series 3.

4. EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS, EXPECTATIONS, AND ABILITIES OF RURAL MALE HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN MISSISSIPPI, by James F. Shill. Report 24, Education Series 4.

5. CAREERS OF RURAL MALE HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN MISSISSIPPI: A STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL INTERESTS, ASPIRATIONS, AND EXPECTATIONS, by James F. Shill. Report 26, Education Series 5.

6. SELF-APPRAISAL OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN MISSISSIPPI BY LOCAL SCHOOL COMMITTEES AND INSTRUCTORS, by Arthur R. Jones, Jr. Report 30, Education Series 6.

7. OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT: A PROGRAM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY, by James E. Wall and James F. Shill. Administrative Report 3, Education Series 7.

8. EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL PROFILES OF BUSINESS EDUCATION GRADUATES OF MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY: 1960-1968, by Shirley T. Alcantara. Report 32, Education Series 8.

9. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MISSISSIPPI CHOCTAW INDIANS, by John H. Peterson, Jr. Report 34, Education Series 9.

10. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MISSISSIPPI, by Allen Terry Steed. Report 37, Education Series 10.

This report summarizes the major findings of a study conducted as

a description and self-appraisal of vocational education programs for special needs students in secondary schools in Mississippi. This report should be useful in providing vocational educators and administrators with information that could be utilized in the decision-making process. Information in the report also could be valuable in resource allocation, program planning and improvement, staff selection and training, and program implementation of educational experiences for special needs students.

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to Drs. James E. Wall and James F. Shill, Co-Directors of the Mississippi Research Coordinating Unit, Mississippi State University, and Mr. W. T. Taylor, Jr., State Supervisor, Disadvantaged and Handicapped, Mississippi State Department of Education, Vocational Education Division, for their consultations and assistance. The writer also wishes to express his appreciation to the Mississippi teachers, administrators, and students who, by their cooperation, made this study possible.

A. T. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	The Problem and Objectives	2
	Research Methodology	3
	Theoretical Frame of Reference	3
	Research Design and Method	3
	Analytical Design and Method	4
II.	Findings	5
	Program Information	5
	Teacher Characteristics	10
	Student Information	16
	Self-Appraisal of Programs by Teachers and Administrators	16
III.	Summary, Conclusions, and Implications	27
IV.	Selected Bibliography	31
V.	Appendices	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Enrollment and Dropout Information for Special Needs Students	6
2.	Development of Program Curriculum as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators of Special Needs Programs	8
3.	Instructional Material Used in Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators	9
4.	Personal Characteristics of Teachers in Special Needs Programs	10
5.	Information Concerning Formal Education of Teachers of Special Needs Students	12
6.	Organizational Affiliations of Teachers of Special Needs Students	13
7.	Work Experience and Teaching Experience of Teachers of Special Needs Students	14
8.	Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Views on Procedure for Student Selection for Special Needs Programs	17
9.	Degree of Communication Between Persons Involved in the Programs for Special Needs Students as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators	18
10.	Professional Organizational Participation and Improvement of Teachers in the Program as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators	20
11.	Appraisal of Facilities, Equipment, and Materials Used in Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators	20
12.	Degree of Acceptance of Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators	21
13.	Degree to Which Students Have Benefited from the Special Needs Programs as Viewed by the Teachers and Administrators	23
14.	Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Self-Appraisal of the Curriculum of the Special Needs Program	25
15.	Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Self-Appraisal of the Overall Program	25

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MISSISSIPPI

I. INTRODUCTION

During the past years people have viewed education as an effective means of insuring individuals productive places in society. Vocational education, being a part of the total educational program in the public schools, has continued to meet the needs of technological society through increased standards for its programs in addition to new programs. Vocational educators have been struggling for years to improve the image of vocational education and to prevent their program from becoming the "dumping grounds" for students unable to succeed in general educational programs. Thus a definite need emerged for vocational education programs to develop skills in students unable to succeed in regular programs.

In 1962 attention was focused upon the needs of students when the President's Panel of Consultants delineated problems of a group they labeled as "Youth with Special Needs."[1] Following this report more attention was directed toward this group by the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Under this Act programs could be established to meet the needs of these students. Section 4(a) of the Act states:

> Vocational Education shall be provided for persons who have academic, socio-economic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational education programs.[2]

---

1. U.S. Dept. of HEW, Report of Consultants on Vocational Education: Education for a Changing World of Work. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964, p. 126.

2. Public Law 88-210, 88th Congress, HR 4955, December 18, 1963. The Vocational Act of 1963.

With the passage of this Act, additional responsibility was placed on vocational education to educate "special needs" or disadvantaged students. In recent years pilot programs were begun for special needs students. These programs have served as guides for expansion of special needs programs. Under provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968[3], special programs were developed with the aid of federal funding to serve special needs students. Each state was required to designate not less than 15 percent of the total vocational funds available for special needs programs. With special emphasis placed on vocational education to provide such services, numerous new programs for special needs students are being implemented.

With the rapid increase in number of programs for special needs students operating in Mississippi, a definite need was felt for a detailed description and self-appraisal of existing programs. Information thus obtained could be utilized in strengthening ongoing programs and in establishing new programs.

The Problem and Objectives

This study was concerned primarily with the description and self-appraisal of vocational education programs for special needs students in Mississippi secondary schools. It also was concerned with determining and analyzing specific strengths and weaknesses of such programs. The central purpose of this study was to provide vocational educators and administrators with information that could be utilized in the decision-making process. This information could be valuable in resource allocation, program planning and improvement, staff selection and training, and program implementation of educational experiences for special needs students.

---

3. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, HR 18366, 90th Congress, Second Session, Report 1938, October 2, 1968.

The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To provide a composite description of existing programs for special needs students.
2. To provide a profile of the teachers of special needs students.
3. To provide information on students enrolled in special needs classes.
4. To compare the self-appraisal of vocational education programs for special needs students between local school administrators and teachers of special needs students.
5. To determine how well the program has been accepted by the special needs students, parents of special needs students, and the public.

Research Methodology

Theoretical Frame of Reference

For this study it was assumed that teachers of special needs students were qualified for their positions. It also was assumed that administrators and teachers worked together cooperatively in the program and that both were well informed on the specific aspects of the program. It was assumed that these programs were designed to prepare students for employment and that the curriculum was designed specifically for the program. It was further assumed that the program would decrease the dropout rate and increase the student's interest in school.

Research Design and Method

The first phase of this study was the development of instruments to gather data needed for the study. Three instruments were developed for use. These instruments were: (1) a questionnaire for teachers of

special needs students (Appendix A), (2) a questionnaire for the administrators of schools with special needs programs (Appendix B), and (3) an intensive interview guide for teachers of special needs students, administrators of schools with special needs programs, and also for the students.

A total of 55 teachers of special needs students were included in this study. These 55 teachers were from 30 Mississippi secondary schools; therefore, the administrators from these 30 schools also were used in the study. Questionnaires were mailed to these teachers and administrators, to be completed and returned. Forty-six of the 55 teachers (83.8 percent) returned questionnaires, and 17 of the 30 administrators (56.6 percent) also returned questionnaires. The interviews were held with a stratified sample of those returning questionnaires. This sample included ten teachers, ten administrators, and 45 students in special needs programs.

Analytical Design and Method

Information on the completed questionnaires concerning special needs programs was transferred to International Business Machine (IBM) code sheets, and then to IBM cards for electronic computations. Tabulations and statistical tests were performed on electronic computers in the Mississippi State University Computing Center.

The statistical procedures involved were computation of frequencies, percentages, distributions, means, and ranks.

Data collected from the questionnaires and interviews were used to present information concerning teacher characteristics, program information, student information, curriculum information, and a self-appraisal of the programs.

II. FINDINGS

This section of the report deals with specific findings obtained from data reported in questionnaires and interviews. This chapter will be divided into the following four major divisions: Program Information, Teacher Characteristics, Student Information, and Self-Appraisal of Special Needs Programs.

Program Information

Special needs programs included in this study were in the following subject areas: agricultural education, business and office education, building and trades education, home economics education, health occupations education, basic education, and trade and industrial education.

As indicated in Table I, enrollment in these programs ranged from a low of 21 to a high of 40. However, 50 percent of the programs had enrollments between 21 and 40 students. The dropout rate (also indicated in Table I) varied among schools. Some programs reported having a dropout rate as high as 21 percent or greater, while others reported no dropouts. Twenty-three percent of those responding reported a dropout rate of from 1 to 5 percent. Teachers and administrators both were asked to give reasons for students dropping out of the programs. The following are the major reasons reported: employment, required to work at home, financial problems, family problems, lack of encouragement from parents, dislike of discipline, lack of interest, transfer to another school, returned to regular class, lack of attendance, and age differences in the class. Even though retention was still of concern in some programs, 71 percent of the teachers felt that the program had

Table 1. Enrollment and Dropout Information on Programs for Special Needs Students

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
1. Total Enrollment:		
a. 0-10 students	0	--
b. 11-20 students	8	17
c. 21-30 students	13	27
d. 31-40 students	11	23
e. 41-50 students	0	--
f. 51 or more students	0	--
g. No Response	13	27
2. Percentage of Dropouts During the 1968-69 Year:		
a. 0	5	10
b. 1-5%	11	23
c. 6-10%	7	15
d. 11-15%	1	2
e. 16-20%	1	2
f. 21% or Greater	0	--
g. No Response	20	43
3. Major Reasons for Dropping Out:		
a. Employment	1	2
b. Required to Work at Home	6	13
c. Financial Reasons	4	8
d. Family Problems	1	2
e. Lack of Encouragement from Parents	2	4
f. Dislike of Discipline	1	2
g. Lack of Interest	5	10
h. Transfer to Another School	3	6
i. Students Returned to Regular Classes	3	6
j. Age Difference	2	4
k. Marriage	3	6
l. Lack of Attendance	3	6
4. Effects of the Program on Dropout Rate:		
a. Increase	0	--
b. Decrease	33	71
c. No Change	12	26
5. Educational Level of Students in Program:		
a. Less than 9th Grade	11	23
b. 9th Grade	5	10
c. 10th Grade	8	17
d. 11th Grade	9	19
e. 12th Grade	6	13
f. Combination of 9-12th grades	22	47
g. Former Dropouts	2	4

decreased the number of dropouts from their programs. One possible reason for this decrease in the dropout rate was apparently the increased interest in school. Students were now becoming interested in school because they were succeeding in something, whereas they previously had been accustomed to continuous failure. These students also indicated that they were able to see benefits from these classes in finding employment. They also were taught on an individual basis which allowed them to progress at their own rate and removed the fear of being left behind by their classmates.

The educational level of these students (See Table I) also indicated a variation among the students. Generally, students enrolled in the program were in grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve, as well as some dropouts who were not listed in any grade category. This wide range of grade levels also indicated strong support for use of individualized instruction to its fullest extent.

Table 2 of this report deals with the development of curriculum for special needs programs. Generally, both teachers and administrators felt the curriculums developed in their schools could be adapted to similar programs in other schools. Both indicated that specific planning adapted the curriculum to meet the needs of these students. The most widely used adaptation of subject matter for the program was simplification of ideas from existing materials.

The curriculums for these programs were reported to be both skill-oriented and individual- or person-oriented. The interviews, however, support the skill-orientation to a much greater extent than the person-orientation. This was an interesting point since the programs were supposedly centered around individualized instruction. It was interesting to note that only 8 percent of the programs indicated that major emphasis

Table 2. Development of Program Curriculum as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators of Special Needs Programs.

Item	Teachers Frequency	Teachers %	Administrators Frequency	Administrators %
1. Adaptability of Curriculum to Similar Programs:				
a. Adaptable	30	65	10	58
b. Nonadaptable	13	20	6	35
c. No Response	3	6	1	2
2. Curriculum Specifically Planned for This Program:				
a. Specifically Planned	35	54	12	70
b. Not Specifically Planned	19	41	4	23
c. No Response	1	2	1	2
3. Adaptation of Subject Matter to Abilities and Needs of Students:				
a. Simplifying Ideas from Existing Materials	27	58	11	64
b. Reproducing Diagrams, Charts, and other Materials for Special Needs Students	16	34	3	17
c. Adapting Concepts found in Existing Materials to a Specially Designed Practical Exercise	12	26	8	47
d. No Special Efforts Made	2	4	1	5
e. Other	5	10	2	11
4. Description of Curriculum:				
a. Person-oriented	2	4	1	5
b. Skill-oriented	7	15	8	47
c. Emphasis on Behavioral Objectives	0	--	0	--
d. Emphasis on Understanding the Individual	2	4	0	--
e. Combination of All the Above	32	69	7	47

was placed on understanding the individual. It was felt by most administrators that emphasis should be placed on training the students to become skilled in a specific area, not in a broad field where there would be flexibility for the students.. There was very little emphasis placed on basic education for these students, either incorporated into the skill training portion of the program or as a separate part.

Teachers and administrators were asked questions concerning the instructional materials utilized in the programs. Table 3 indicates that 47 percent of the teachers and 58 percent of the administrators felt the supply of available instructional material was adequate. Subject matter used in these programs was developed by simplifying ideas from existing materials. This was necessary because there was a very limited supply of materials available designed especially for these programs. When asked to list sources of instructional material, only 20 percent of the teachers could name one source. This could mean two things: either teachers were not knowledgeable of instructional material sources, or there are very few such sources available.

Table 3. Instructional Material Used in Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators.

Item	Teachers		Administrators	
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%
1. Availability of Instructional Materials:				
a. Adequate supply	22	47	10	58
b. Inadequate supply	24	51	7	41
2. Types of Material Used in the Program:				
a. Lesson Plans	31	67	9	52
b. Assignment Sheets	15	32	4	23
c. Information Sheets	12	26	8	47
d. Activity Sheets	13	28	4	23
e. Evaluation (testing)	30	65	10	58
f. Texts, References, Workbooks, and Resource Materials and People	32	69	15	88
g. Modern Instructional Material	20	43	7	41

The specific types of materials used in the programs are also listed in Table 3. According to most teachers and administrators, the following types of materials were utilized in their programs: lesson plans, evaluation (testing), texts, references, workbooks, resource

materials and people, and modern instructional materials. It was especially interesting to note that lesson plans were identified as being widely used, but only approximately 20 percent of the teachers could show any lesson plans during the interviews. The reason for the limited use of lesson plans could be the lack of available instructional materials, or possibly the lack of requirement by administrators for the use of lesson plans, or a lack of knowledge on the part of teachers in lesson plan preparation. Teachers also expressed concern for their varied lessons from day to day due to the necessity of working with the type of equipment that was available each day.

The programs for special needs students, as previously described, are relatively new; therefore, there is much more praise due these programs for their progress. However, there must be continued efforts made to improve them and make them even more effective through evaluation, planning, supervision, programing, and budgeting.

Teacher Characteristics

In the questionnaires teachers were asked questions concerning specific personal information about themselves. This section of the report will present information concerning teachers of special needs students such as: sex, age, marital status, size of community the teacher grew up in, annual income of teacher's parents while he was growing up, formal education, major field of college study, organizational affiliations and work experience, (both teaching and nonteaching).

Approximately two-thirds of the teachers included in the study were male (See Table 4). The ages of teachers ranged from 26 to 60 years or above, but the largest percentage (62 percent) were between the ages of

20 and 39. Most teachers (80 percent) were married and grew up in a rural area or a small town. This was interesting to note, because most of the children being taught were from the same type areas.

Table 4. Personal Characteristics of Teachers in Special Needs Programs

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
1. Sex:		
a. Male	30	65
b. Female	16	35
2. Age:		
a. Below 20	0	--
b. 20-29	19	41
c. 30-39	10	21
d. 40-49	7	15
e. 50-59	9	19
f. 60 or above	1	2
3. Marital Status:		
a. Single	5	10
b. Married	37	80
c. Separated	0	--
d. Divorced	2	4
e. Remarried	1	2
f. Widowed	0	--
4. Size of Community the Teacher Grew Up In:		
a. Rural	23	50
b. Small town (under 1,999 population)	12	26
c. Town	8	17
d. City (10,000-24,999)	1	2
e. City (25,000 and above)	2	4
5. Annual Income of Teacher's Parents While He Was Growing Up:		
a. Less than $999	2	4
b. $1,000-$1,999	10	21
c. $2,000-$2,999	9	19
d. $3,000-$3,999	8	17
e. $4,000-$4,999	3	6
f. $5,000-$5,999	5	10
g. $6,000-$6,999	2	4
h. $7,000-$7,999	1	2
i. $8,000-$8,999	2	4
j. $9,000 or above	0	--

The economic status of these teachers' families while they were growing up was also closely related to the students' situation with 57 percent of them having an annual income of between $1,000 and $3,999. There were, however, some whose families had reported up to $8,999 annual incomes.

The formal education of teachers of special needs students, as indicated in table 5, was reported to range from a high school education to a master's degree, with 50 percent of them having a bachelor's degree.

Table 5. Information Concerning Formal Education of Teachers of Special Needs Students

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
1. Formal Educational Level:		
a. 8th grade or less	0	--
b. 9th grade to 12th grade	0	--
c. Completed High School	8	17
d. Completed Vocational School	2	4
e. 2 Years or Less College	8	18
f. 2-3½ Years College	3	6
g. Bachelor's Degree	23	50
h. Master's Degree	1	2
i. Other	0	--
2. Major Field of College Study:		
a. Does not apply	8	17
b. Agricultural Education	3	6
c. Guidance Education	0	--
d. Business and Office	3	6
e. Trade and Industrial	13	28
f. Health Education	5	10
g. Home Economics Education	5	10
h. Distributive Education	0	--
i. Industrial Arts	9	19
j. Other	0	--

Their major fields of college study were reported to be: agricultural education (6 percent), business and office education (6 percent), trade and industrial education (28 percent), health education (10 percent), home economics education (19 percent), sociology (4 percent), and

English (4 percent). It was noted that four teachers reported majors in subject areas not at all related to the vocational subject areas in which they were teaching.

The organizational affiliations of teachers of special needs students are shown in Table 6. Teachers reported affiliations with churches, civic clubs, fraternal organizations, social action organizations, educational organizations, and vocational education organizations. Of the reported organizations, most teachers were affiliated with church, educational, and vocational education organizations.

Table 6. Organizational Affiliations of Teachers of Special Needs Students

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
1. Type of Organizations:		
a. Chruch	42	91
b. Civic Club	12	26
c. Fraternal	8	17
d. Social Action	9	19
e. Education	26	56
f. Vocational Education	23	50
2. Educational Organizations:		
a. Mississippi Education Association	18	39
b. National Education Association	21	46
c. Mississippi Teachers Association	20	43
d. Mississippi Vocational Association	5	10
e. Magnolia State Vocational Association	6	13
f. County teachers associations	6	13

Less than 50 percent of the teachers were active in any types of educational organizations. The main educational organizations with which teachers were affiliated were the Mississippi Education Association, the National Education Association, and the Mississippi Teachers Association. Despite the fact that they were teaching in vocational education, only 23 percent of the teachers were active in any type of vocational education association. These teachers were active in the Mississippi Vocational Association or the Magnolia State Vocational Association.

Teachers also were asked to list and explain all work experiences (both teaching and nonteaching) they had received which were directly related to the area in which they were teaching. As indicated in Table 7, the length of nonteaching work experiences ranged from one to ten years or more. The largest groups of teachers indicated either one year or less of experience or ten years or more. Some teachers failed to indicate any nonteaching work experiences.

Table 7. Work Experience and Teaching Experience of Teachers of Special Needs Students

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
1. Length of Nonteaching Work Experience Directly Related to the Field in Which Teaching:		
a. 1 year or less	14	30
b. 2-3 years	7	15
c. 4-5 years	6	13
d. 6-9 years	4	8
e. 10 years or more	14	30
2. Work Experience Directly Related to the Field in Which Teaching:		
a. Welder	3	6
b. Farm Equipment Dealer	3	6
c. Farm Equipment Mechanic	14	30
d. Auto Mechanic	7	15
e. Farm Manager	1	2
f. Farmer	6	13
g. Nurse	1	2
h. Secretary	2	4
i. Construction Worker	4	8
j. Social Worker	2	4
k. Homemaker	1	2
l. Cafeteria Worker, Waitress	1	2
3. Previous Teaching Experience		
a. 1 year or less	11	23
b. 2-3 years	20	43
c. 4-5 years	5	10
d. 6-9 years	3	6
e. 10 years or more	7	15

Table 7. (Continued)

Item	Program Frequency	Program Percentage
4. Area of Teaching Experience:		
a. Agricultural Education	6	13
b. Business and Office Education	3	6
c. Distributive Education	0	--
d. Guidance Education	3	6
e. Health Education	5	10
f. Home Economics Education	1	2
g. Industrial Arts	15	32
h. Trade and Industrial Education	13	28

The specific areas of nonteaching work experiences also varied (See Table 7). The area in which the largest percentage (30 percent) of the teachers had received experience was farm equipment mechanic. Fifty-one percent of the teachers received work experience in an area related to agriculture, while 29 percent had work experiences in some area related to trade and industrial education. Other work experience areas reported by teachers were as follows: nurse, secretary, construction worker, welder, social worker, homemaker, cafeteria worker and waitress.

Also listed in Table 7 is the number of years previous teaching experience. The majority of teachers (66 percent) reported teaching as long as ten or more years. The specific areas of teaching experiences were reported to be the following: agricultural education (13 percent), business and office education (6 percent), guidance education (6 percent), health education (10 percent), home economics education (2 percent), industrial arts (32 percent), and trade and industrial education (28 percent). It was noted also that some teachers reported their only teaching experience to be in such areas as English, history, social science, and sociology, although they were teaching in some area of vocational education. However, it is possible that these teachers were teaching basic education within

the service area they checked rather than teaching vocational education subjects.

Student Information

In giving descriptions of the students who were enrolled in these special needs programs, teachers and administrators were asked certain questions concerning these students (See Table 8).

Generally, teachers and administrators viewed the students as being either educationally deprived or a combination of educationally deprived, socially disadvantaged, and ethnically disadvantaged. Actually the interviews supported the opinions that most students were educationally deprived or behind or failing in their academic subjects.

Students were selected in a number of ways, but generally, teachers and administrators agreed that the procedure used most often was a cooperative selection committee. This committee was composed of the vocational teachers, guidance counselor, administrator, and certain other teachers in the school. Also indicated in Table 8 is the basis by which the committee selected students for the program. Generally, students were selected by their past records or by observed student ability.

Apparently the procedure for grouping students in cases where large enrollments required the division of classes into sections was accomplished generally by random selection. There were, however, some programs which grouped the students by mental ability.

Self-Appraisal of Programs by Teachers and Administrators

The second portion of this study was concerned with a self-appraisal of programs for special needs students by teachers and administrators who are working with these programs. A list of several aspects of the programs was included in the questionnaire sent to both teachers and administrators.

Table 8. Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Views on Procedure for Student Selection for Special Needs Programs

Item	Teachers		Administrators	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1. Type of Handicap:				
a. Educationally Deprived	17	36	8	47
b. Socially Disadvantaged	--	--	1	5
c. Ethnically Disadvantaged	--	--	--	--
d. Combination of Above	29	63	8	47
2. Selection of Students for the Program:				
a. Teacher required to take all who were sent	8	17	1	5
b. Teacher takes all who are interested	5	10	--	--
c. Teacher and administrator select from all who are interested	7	15	--	--
d. Teacher selects from those referred by other teachers	2	4	1	5
e. Guidance counselor selects all those who meet qualifying criteria and provides teacher with list from which teacher selects	1	2	1	5
f. Cooperative selection committee composed of vocational teacher, guidance counselor, administrator, and certain teachers make decision on basis of tests, records, and observed student abilities	12	26	4	23
g. Combination of the above	12	26	4	23
3. Assistance to the Teacher in Student Selection:				
a. No Assistance	14	30	0	--
b. Guidance Counselor	4	8	3	17
c. School Administrator	5	10	0	--
d. Vocational Teacher	0	--	3	17
e. Other Teachers	1	2	0	--
f. Combination of all the above	19	41	11	64
4. Basis for Selection of Students:				
a. Tests	4	8	4	23
b. Past Records	24	52	12	70
c. Observed Student Ability	22	47	9	52
d. Other	12	26	2	11
5. Procedure for Grouping Students if There Were More Than one Section:				
a. Mental Ability	6	13	3	17
b. Social Compatibility	0	--	0	--
c. Random Selection	11	23	5	41
d. No answer	28	64	9	52

They were asked to rate each of these aspects according to the following scale: 7-6 Superior, 5-4-3 Average, 2-1 Poor. These ratings were used to rank the items according to means and also to compare teachers' and administrators' responses to each question.

Table 9 lists the responses concerning the degree of communication sustained between persons involved in special needs programs. Teachers ranked the degree of communication sustained between special needs students and teachers of special needs students first, with a rating of high-average to superior.

Table 9. Degree of Communication Between Persons Involved in the Programs for Special Needs Students as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators

Item	Teachers		Administrators	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Degree of communication sustained between special needs students and teachers of special needs students.	5.93	1	5.64	1
2. Degree of communication sustained between State Department personnel and local school personnel.	4.84	2	5.64	1
3. Degree to which guidance personnel are involved in the program.	4.75	3	5.41	3
4. Degree of communication sustained between faculty members and teachers of special needs students.	4.42	4	4.47	4
5. Degree to which other vocational teachers in the school are involved with special needs students.	4.37	5	4.06	5
6. Degree of communication sustained between administration and teachers of special needs students.	4.13	6	3.25	7
7. Degree to which other faculty members in the school are involved with special needs students.	2.83	7	4.00	6

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

This same aspect also received a high ranking (first) from administrators who rated it high-average. The items receiving the lowest ranking from administrators and teachers were the degree of communication sustained between administrators and teachers of special needs students and the degree to which other faculty members were involved in the programs. This feeling was strongly supported in the interviews. Teachers indicated they were not completely satisfied with the way administrators were administering their respective programs. For instance, some teachers explained that administrators were using their classes for maintenance crews to do repair work on the school campus. Administrators also felt the special needs programs were not as well developed as they could be and needed considerable amounts of planning and reorganizing before they would be completely successful. They pointed out such weaknesses as: teachers were not well-equipped in methods and techniques of teaching; student selection procedures were not as clear as they should be; and most of all, no one completely understood exactly how the program should be operated.

As indicated in Table 10, teachers and administrators felt that teachers' professional improvement was at least average, but administrators were specific in pointing out certain areas where teachers should try to improve. The most frequent area mentioned concerning teacher improvement was a need for more training in methods and techniques of teaching. Ratings were given by teachers and administrators (See Table 10) for the degree of professional organization participation of teachers. Both teachers and administrators rated the item average, but information reported in Table 6 indicated only approximately one-half of the teachers were reported to have any professional organizational affiliation. Less than one-fourth of the teachers reported

Table 10. Professional Organizational Participation and Improvement of Teachers in the Program as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators.

Item	Teacher Mean	Teacher Rank	Administrator Mean	Administrator Rank
1. Degree of professional improvement of teachers of special needs students.	5.07	1	4.88	1
2. Degree of professional organization participation of teachers of special needs students.	4.20	2	4.12	2

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

affiliations with any type of professional organizations.

Teachers and administrators appraised the facilities, equipment, and materials used in these programs generally as being average, as pointed out in Table 11. Both teachers and administrators felt that the degree to which equipment was adequate should be rated as average; however, teachers rated the equipment higher than did administrators.

Table 11. Appraisal of Facilities, Equipment, and Materials Used in Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators

Item	Teachers Mean	Teachers Rank	Administrators Mean	Administrators Rank
1. Degree to which equipment is adequate and up-to-date for program.	5.05	1	4.58	1
2. Degree to which facilities are adequate for program for special needs students.	4.73	2	4.47	3
3. Degree to which instructional materials are appropriate for special needs students.	4.48	3	4.53	2

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

The interviews especially pointed out that teachers generally felt equipment and facilities were inadequate for the most effective teaching. Almost all teachers (95 percent) expressed the need for more modern equipment to provide more effective instruction. Many teachers indicated they could not provide a complete course because they did not have the necessary tools or equipment to do so. Some felt their building facilities, such as shop area, were too small. An example of this type problem was a special needs teacher sharing a shop with a vo-ag teacher. Both classes apparently were decreasing their effectiveness as both were attempting to work in the shop at the same time.

In Table 12 a comparison of teachers' and administrators' views toward the degree of acceptance of special needs programs is shown. Teachers and administrators felt that students had accepted the program to a greater degree than had parents or the public. In fact, teachers rated parents' acceptance low-average, indicating that parents were not giving the program total support.

Table 12. Degree of Acceptance of Special Needs Programs as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators.

Item	Teachers		Administrator	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Degree to which students have accepted the program.	5.20	1	5.00	1
2. Degree to which public has accepted the program for special needs youth.	4.15	2	4.92	2
3. Degree to which parents of students have accepted the program.	3.71	3	4.47	3

Rating Scale: Superior 7 - 6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

The interviews brought out certain points concerning program acceptance. Teachers indicated that parents were reluctant to accept the program at first, but later became somewhat more satisfied with it. One reason given for this lack of acceptance was the absence of a properly planned orientation program for students, parents, and the public. Only 20 percent of the programs indicated that any parent-guidance counselor conferences or any other type conferences were held to discuss the program and to explain why their children were placed in it. It was also brought out by teachers that the general public would be more responsive to the program if they completely understood it. Students explained that some of the other students in school made fun of them because they were in this program. This is probably one of the most serious problems in special needs programs. Perhaps this situation caused many students, as well as parents, to reject the program. However, those who remained in the program agreed that it had been beneficial to them.

Table 13 indicates the degree to which students have benefited from the special needs programs. Both teachers and administrators agreed that students had been helped in various ways by the program. Some ways teachers, administrators, and students stated the program had helped the students were as follows: aids students in finding employment, provides students an opportunity to develop a skill, encourages students to remain in school, provides practical work experiences for the student, teaches the student the importance of cooperating and working together, and gives these students a chance to succeed at something. Some of these students had histories of varying degrees of "nonsuccess," or "almost failure."

Teachers felt to a greater extent than did administrators that the

program had prevented dropouts. However, the administrators were seemingly in a better position to judge this aspect of the program. Both teachers and administrators felt an average number of special needs students participated in extracurricular activities. In the interviews with teachers and administrators it was brought out that many special needs classes were scheduled at the same time as extracurricular activities. It would be impossible for these students to take part in extracurricular activities, and this could be a strong deterrent to the programs.

Table 13. Degree to Which Students Have Benefited from the Special Needs Programs as Viewed by the Teachers and Administrators

Item	Teachers Mean	Teachers Rank	Administrator Mean	Administrator Rank
1. Degree to which the program has helped students.	5.33	1	5.59	1
2. Degree to which the program has prevented dropouts.	5.13	2	4.65	4
3. Degree to which special needs students participate in the school's extracurricular activities.	4.98	3	4.82	3
4. Degree to which special needs students receive directed work experience at placed other than the school.	3.89	4	5.12	2

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

Teachers and administrators showed some difference of opinion regarding the degree to which students receive directed work experience at places other than school. Teachers rated this aspect of the program low-average, while administrators rated it high-average. This may be an indication that administrators are not as familiar as they should be with

the programs. In the interviews, teachers mentioned certain problems with directed work experience programs such as difficulty in placing these students in industries to receive this experience, and a lack of encouragement for this aspect of the program. It would seem that teachers are in a better position to evaluate this aspect of the program.

Teachers and administrators also were asked to appraise their curriculum. Table 14 shows the responses received concerning the curriculum. Teachers felt the curriculum was more adequate than did administrators; however, the rating differentials were not significant. Administrators felt that students' nonvocational courses are more closely keyed to the special needs programs than did teachers. This may be another indication of administrators' lack of knowledge about the programs. Teachers gave some examples of how these courses should be keyed to the program, such as the fact that math could be taught with reference to building and trades or construction work. This concept would show students a need for understanding math and therefore, he would receive more meaning from working math problems .

The degree to which desirable personal characteristics and work habits were developed was viewed by teachers and administrators as being average. Teachers indicated that because of the lack of directed work experiences received out of school, only a limited degree of personal work habits could be developed. Teachers felt (perhaps wrongly) there were very few chances to develop such characteristics and work habits in the school shop; however, teachers did indicate that the students had developed a sense of cooperation and working together.

Table 14. Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Self-Appraisal of the Curriculum of the Special Needs Programs

Item	Teacher		Administrator	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Degree to which curriculum is adequate and up-to-date.	5.05	1	4.29	3
2. Degree to which desirable personal characteristics and work habits are developed.	4.82	2	4.76	2
3. Degree to which students' nonvocational courses are keyed to the program for special needs youth.	4.13	3	5.24	1

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

In Table 15 a comparison of teachers' and administrators' self-appraisals of the overall programs was presented. It was noted that no program received a rating higher than high-average or lower than average. The program receiving the highest rating by teachers was home economics, while administrators rated this program second. Administrators rated health occupations first, but teachers rated this program fourth. The program receiving the lowest rating by teachers and administrators was distributive education, with a rating of average from both groups.

Table 15. Comparison of Teachers' and Administrators' Self-Appraisal of the Overall Program

Item	Teacher		Administrator	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Home Economics	5.46	1	5.16	2
2. Trade and Industrial Education	5.33	2	4.72	5
3. Agriculture	5.25	3	4.75	4
4. Health Occupations	5.14	4	5.50	1
5. Business and Office	5.00	5	5.00	3
6. Distributive Education	4.60	6	4.00	6

Rating Scale: Superior 7-6 Average 5-4-3 Poor 2-1

III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This report presents the findings of a study on the description and self-appraisal of special needs programs in vocational education in 46 Mississippi secondary schools. These programs were in the subject areas of agricultural education, business and office education, building and trades, home economics education, health occupations education, trade and industrial education, and basic education.

The following generalizations were drawn from the data reported in this study:

1. Most teachers of special needs students were between the ages of 20 and 39.
2. Most teachers of special needs students were married.
3. Most teachers of special needs students were from families with an annual income of less than $4,000 and had grown up in rural areas or small towns.
4. Formal education of teachers of special needs students ranged from a high school diploma (or completion of G.E.D. test) to a master's degree, with many completing college.
5. Most teachers felt that the program had helped decrease the dropout rate in their school.
6. Most teachers and administrators indicated that subject matter utilized in their program was developed by simplifying ideas from existing materials.
7. Most teachers and administrators felt that the availability of instructional material was merely adequate, or less than adequate.

8. The educational level of students enrolled in the special needs programs generally ranged from the 9th to the 12th grades.
9. Most students enrolled in special needs programs were educationally deprived.

In general, teachers and administrators appraised the special needs programs as being at least average, with only a few exceptions. There were certain aspects of the programs, according to findings of this study, that should be of prime concern for the coming years. Some of these are as follows:

1. Most programs were not adequately equipped to do the most effective job possible.
2. Most programs were operated without any orientation program for students, parents, or the public.
3. Some teachers of special needs students were reported as having no previous experience or education in an area related to the subject which they were teaching.
4. Other teachers in the school system were not directly involved in the special needs programs, and guidance personnel were involved only on a limited basis.
5. Most administrators felt teachers in these programs needed additional training in methods and techniques of teaching. Conversely, most teachers felt administrators needed greater understanding of program philosophy and details.
6. Most teachers did not use course outlines, specific objectives, or daily lesson plans.
7. Most administrators were viewed as not having sufficient knowledge or understanding of the special needs programs and possibly for

this reason failed to give the special needs programs the prestige necessary to motivate the students involved.

8. Most teachers were not familiar with any instructional materials designed specifically for the special needs program.

This study indicates that the programs have served the special needs students in many ways. Probably the greatest contribution these programs have made is in providing students opportunities to be successful in some area of educational experiences and by providing opportunities to develop skills which will enable them to find adequate employment.

IV. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Educational Research Association. "Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children," Review of Educational Research, 35 (December 1965), 373-442.

American Home Economics Association. "Working with Low Income Families," Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, March 15-19, 1965. Prepared by the American Home Economics Association, Washington, D. C., 1965.

Arnez, N. L. "The Effect of Teacher Attitudes Upon the Culturally Indifferent," School and Society, 94 (March 19, 1966), 149-152.

Austin, John J. and Donald A. Sommerfield. An Evaluation of Vocational Education for Disadvantaged Youth. The Public Schools of the City of Muskegon, Muskegon, Michigan, 1967.

Ausubel, David P. "A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations," School Review, 71 (Winter 1963), 454-463.

Bagdikan, Ben. In the Midst of Plenty: A New Report on the Poor in America. New York: Signet Books, 1964.

Banta, Trudy W. and Douglas C. Towne. Interpretive Study of Cooperative Efforts of Private Industry and the Schools to Provide Job-Oriented Educational Programs for the Disadvantaged. Occupation Research and Development Coordinating Unit, College of Education, University of Tennessee. 1969.

Beavers, Irene. "Contributions Home Economics Can Make to Low Income Families," Journal of Home Economics, 57 (February 1965), 107-111.

Bell, Howard. Youth Tell Their Story. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1938.

Bendix, Reinhard, and Seymour Lipset, eds. Class, Status, and Power. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953.

Berlin, Irving. "Special Learning Problems of Deprived Children," National Education Association Journal, 55 (March 1963), 23-24.

Boynton, P. L. and R. D. Woolvine. "The Relationship Between the Economic Status of High School Girls and Their Vocational Wishes and Expectation," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26 (1942), 399-415.

Buchanan, Bobbie B. "How to Teach Children with Special Needs," American Vocational Journal, 33 (January 1969), 39.

Bunt, Samuel M. "A Three-Year Program Plan for your Advisory Committee," American Vocational Journal, 43 (September 1968) 13-14.

Campbell, R. E., J. L. Parson, S. H. Asipow, F. M. Fletcher, and M. N. Mehrotra. Vocational Development of Disadvantaged Junior High School Students. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, August, 1969.

Campbell, Sally. "Teaching Consumer Education," Forecast, 14 (January 1969), F-26.

Caplovitz, David. The Poor Pay More. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Carlton, Lessie, and Robert H. Moore. "Culturally Disadvantaged Children Can be Helped," National Education Association Journal, 55 (September 1966), 13-14.

Conant, James. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Conger, Flora S. "Atlanta Trains Teens for Child Care," What's New in Home Economics, 32 (December 1968), 31.

Crawley, Regis. "Teaching the Slow Learner," Today's Education, 58 (January 1969), 48-59.

Crow, L. D., W. I. Murray, and H. H. Smythe. Educating the Culturally Disadvantaged Child. New York: David McKay, 1966.

Daugherty, Louise G. "Working with Disadvantaged Parents," National Education Association Journal, 52 (December 1963), 18-20.

Della-Dora, Delmo. "Culturally Disadvantaged: Educational Implications of Certain Social-Cultural Phenomena," Exceptional Children, 28 (May 1962), 467-472.

Denard, Cleveland L. "Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged: Planning, Organizing and Operating Through a Systems Approach," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Deutsch, Martin. "Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors," Scholastic Achievement, Monograph No. 2. New York: Society for Applied Anthropology, Cornell University (1960), 116.

Dewees, Dan and Lester Wooten. "Involving the Community in Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged. Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Dye, Robert P., Theodore F. Ruhig, and Irwin I. Tanaka. "Dropout" An Evaluation of a Pilot Dropout Project. Department of Labor and Industrial Education, Honolulu Community Action Program, and the University of Hawaii Community College System, n.d.

_____. Education: An Answer to Poverty. Jointly published by U. S. Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity, n.d.

Education Development Center Annual Report. Educational Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts, 1967.

Eels, K., and others, eds. Intelligence and Cultural Differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Featherstone, W. B. Teaching the Slow Learner. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Feldman, Marvin J. Making Education Relevant. New York: Ford Foundation, 1966.

_____. "Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged: Lessons from Ford Foundation Funded Programs," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Fernandez, Louise. The Slow Learner in Homemaking Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Department of Home Economics, Bulletin No. 10, 1959.

Fleck, Henrietta. "How to Overcome Alienation," Forecast, 14 (November 1968), F-13, 32.

_____. "Education and the Poor," Forecast, 14 (January 1969), F-23.

Frazier, Alexander. "Teaching the Culturally Deprived," National Elementary Principal, 42 (February 1963), 16-19.

Frost, Joe L. "School Environment and Disadvantaged Children," Collected Papers of the Inter-Institutional Seminar in Child Development, Dearborn, Michigan: The Edison Institute, June 1965.

Frost, Joe and Glenn Hawkes, eds. The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

_____. The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Gallington, Ralph O. Basic Criteria for Identifying Potential High School Dropouts. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois School of Technology, June 1965.

_____. The Fate and Probable Future of High School Dropouts and the Identification of Potential High School Dropouts. A Final Report of Research. S.I.V. Research and Projects 21-13-2-49170, June 1, 1965 to January 1, 1966, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, January 1, 1966.

Goldberg, Miriam L. "Adapting Teacher Style to Pupil Differences: Teachers for Disadvantaged Children," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 10 (April 1964), 161-178.

Goldstein, Bernard. Low Income Youth in Urban Areas: A Critical Review of Literature. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967, 271.

Greenfield, Richard. "Counseling and Supportive Services in Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged. Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Groff, Patrick. "Dissatisfactions in Teaching the Culturally Deprived Child," Phi Delta Kappan, 451 (November 1963), 70-76.

Groves, Ramsey M. A National Survey of Vocational Education Programs for Students with Special Needs. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, n.d.

Hamburger, Martin. "Perspectives on the Workshop," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962.

Hattiesburg, Patricia A. "Vocational Education Reaches Out to Homemakers with Special Needs," Vocatio, I (May 1968), 13-15.

Haubrick, Vernon. "The Culturally Different: New Context for Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 14 (June 1963), 141-163.

Hess, R. D. "Obtaining Optimal Educational Opportunity for Disadvantaged Groups," edited by D. C. Rice and P. E. Toth. Conference on the Emerging Role of State Education Departments with Specific Implications for Division of Vocational-Technical Education. 1968.

Hollingshead, August. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.

Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, March 2, 1970, p.3-A.

Kaufman, Harold F., Kenneth P. Wilkinson, and Lucy W. Cole. "Poverty Programs and Social Mobility," State College: Social Science Research Center Preliminary Report 13, September 1966.

Kemp, Barbara H. The Youth We Haven't Served. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. 1966.

Kluckholm, Florence. "Family Diagnosis: Variations in the Basic Values of Family Systems," Social Casework (February-March 1958).

Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation," American Journal of Sociology, 68 (1963), 471-480.

Lewis, Frederick H. "Teachers in a Depressed Area: Most Important Quality for the Teachers of Disadvantaged Children is Compassion," Clearing House, 30 (April 1956), 497-498.

Mackenzie, Louise. "Programmed Learning for Slow Learners," American Vocational Journal, 44 (May 1969), 55-56, 80.

Mackintosh, Helen K., Lillian Gore, and Gertrude M. Lewis. Administration of Elementary School Programs for Disadvantaged Children. Disadvantaged Children Series No. 4, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1966.

_____. Educating Disadvantaged Children in the Middle Grades. Disadvantaged Children Series No. 3, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1965.

Mangum, Garth L. "Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged: Lessons from Government Funded Programs," The Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

McDonough, Frances S. "Curriculum Adaptations," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

_____. "Implications for Curriculums of Vocational Education," Prepared for Institute for Curriculum Development Based on Occupational Analysis, Colorado State University, July 28-August 1, 1969.

McKinley, Donald. Social Class and Family Life. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillian, Limited, 1964.

Meyer, Joan L. How Teachers Can Reach the Disadvantaged. The Pennsylvania State University Institute for Research on Human Resources. University Park, Pennsylvania. n.d.

Mississippi Plan for the Administration of Vocational Education, Part I, p. 38, paragraph 3.12, May 1969.

National Committee on Employment of Youth. A Guide to the Development of Vocational Education Programs and Services for the Disadvantaged. New York, New York, October 1969.

Niederfrank, E. J. Working with the Disadvantaged. United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service, PA-891, October 1968.

Nye, F. Ivan, James F. Short, and Virgil J. Olson. "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 63 (January 1958), 381-389.

Olson, Jerry C. "Curriculum Implications for an Educational System That Meets the Needs of Disadvantaged Students." Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Prescott, Jacquelin. "A Plan for Slow Learners." American Vocational Journal, 43 (December 1968), 49-50.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. The People Left Behind. U. S. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., September 1967.

Programs for Youth with Special Needs. Division of Vocational Education, Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, 1967.

Project Head Start, Daily Program I, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C., n.d.

Quarles, George R. "Case Study: Newark Manpower Training Skills Center." Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Ramundo, Louis and Michael R. Robinson. "Review of Case Presentation Materials and Techniques." The Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Reddick, Lawrence. "The Development of Vocational Education Teachers of the Disadvantaged." Proceedings of National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Reynolds, Kenneth R. "Objective Structure and Implementation of Georgia's Program for Dropouts and Potential Dropouts," Georgia State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education. Proceedings of American Convention, Boston, Massachusetts, December 1969.

Rice, Ann S. "Add New Life to Home Economics Teaching--Bring Reality Into the Classroom," What's New in Home Economics, 33 (January 1969), 11-14.

Riessman, Frank. "Digging 'The Man's' Language," Saturday Review, 49 (September 10, 1966), 80-98.

_____. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Riessman, Frank and Arlene Hannah. "Teachers of the Poor," PTA Magazine, 59 (November 1964), 12-14.

Rilich, Thomas I. Investing in Education to Reduce Poverty. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1969.

Roberts, John S. "The Name of the Game is Jobs Now," American Vocational Journal, 43 (February 1968), 24-26.

"Sausalito Teacher Education Project. Progress Report, September 1, 1967 - January 31, 1968," Sausalita School District, Sausalito, California.

Schrank, Robert and Susan Stein. "Turning Vocational Education to the Disadvantaged: Working with the Employers and Unions." The Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

Simpson, Ray H. "The Teacher's Role to Deal with Human Beings," Vocational Education Journal, 43 (May 1968), 14-16.

Snowden, O. L. and James F. Shill. "Preparing Prospective Vo-Ag Teachers to Work with 'Turned-Off' Students," The Agricultural Education Magazine, 42 (January 1970), 178-179.

Stone, James C. Teachers for the Disadvantaged. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, Inc., 1969.

Symons, Mary Anne. "Foods Class Offers New Experiences for Disadvantaged," Forecast, 14 (February 1969), F-56-57.

Tacionis, Francis B. "Homemaking Students Learn Involvement," What's New in Home Economics, 33 (February 1969), 32.

_____. "Add New Life to Home Economics Teaching--Use Study Tours to Realize Class Theory," What's New in Home Economics, 33 (February 1969), 15-18.

_____. "Add New Life to Home Economics Teaching--Use the Printed Word Creatively," What's New in Home Economics, 33 (May/June 1969), 9-12.

Tacionis, Francis B. and Ann S. Rice. "Add New Life to Home Economics Teaching--Plan Classroom Atmosphere to Stimulate Learning," What's New in Home Economics, 32 (December 1968), 28-30.

_____. "Add New Life to Home Economics Teaching--Use Teaching Materials Effectively," What's New in Home Economics, 32 (November 1968), 13-15.

Tenenbaum, Samuel. "The Teacher, The Middle Class, The Lower Class," Phi Delta Kappan, 45 (November 1963), 86.

The Education of Teachers of the Disadvantaged: A Selected Bibliography. ERIC-Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, Yeshiva University, New York, New York. n.d.

"The Shape of Education for 1969-70," Education USA, National School Public Relations Association, June 1969.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Guidelines: Special Program for Educationally Deprived Children. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Section II. U. S. Office of Education, Division of Program Operations.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Interpretative Study of Cooperative Efforts of Private Industry and the Schools to Provide Job-Oriented Education Programs for the Disadvantaged. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Occupational Research and Development Coordinating Unit, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, April 1969.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education, Programs for the Disadvantaged. U. S. Printing Office, October 1966.

_____. Programs for the Disadvantaged. Office of Education, January 1969.

_____. Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged: A Report of a Conference on Teaching Children and Youth Who are Educationally Disadvantaged. U. S. Printing Office, Bulletin No. 17, 1963.

U. S. Department of Labor. Breakthrough for Disadvantaged Youth. U. S. Printing Office, 1969.

_____. Occupational Outlook Handbook. U. S. Printing Office, Bulletin 1450, 1966-67.

U. S. News and World Report. "White House Plan for Education: Changes, Cutbacks," 68 (January 26, 1970).

"Vocational Education Act of 1963," Public Law 88-210, 88th Congress. U. R. 4955, December 18, 1963.

Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, H.R. 18366, 90th Congress, Second Session, Report 1938, October 2, 1968.

"Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged: Summary of a National Workshop," Proceedings of the National Workshop on Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 12-14, 1969. Sponsored by National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, New York.

"Vocational-Technical Education for the Disadvantaged," Proceedings of Second Annual National Vocational Technical Teacher Education Seminar, Chicago, Illinois, October 21-24, 1968. Sponsored by the Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Vocational Education: Gateway to Jobs. Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio. 1967.

Warner, William L., Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb. Who Shall be Educated? New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

White, Eli E., "Home Economics for Living and Earning a Living," American Vocational Journal, 43 (September 1968), 57-58.

Wologanot, Irene. "Low-Income Groups," Journal of Home Economics, 56 (January 1964), 27-39.

Yourman, Julius. "The Case Against Group IQ Testing," Phi Delta Kappan, 46 (November 1964), 108-110.

V. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FORM # 1

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON TEACHERS' SELF-APPRAISAL
OF SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAMS IN MISSISSIPPI

Name_____ Title_____

Name of local administrative person immediately responsible for program:

_____ Title _____

INTRODUCTION

The State Department of Education, Vocational Division, in cooperation with the Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, is undertaking a self-evaluation of vocational programs for special needs students throughout the State. The purposes of the research are:

(1) to provide information to emerging programs for special needs students.
(2) to identify specific felt strengths and weaknesses in the total program; and
(3) to serve as a basis for developing further research on programs for special needs students.

The procedure for this evaluation involves, first of all, the cooperation of each teacher of special needs students in completing this questionnaire and returning it, using the enclosed self-addressed envelope, to Mississippi State University. All information will be confidential and individual teachers and schools WILL NOT be identified in the research. The second phase will include a short questionnaire to school administrators. In the final phase, a sample of schools with programs will be selected for the purpose of interviewing teachers of special needs students, special needs students, and administrators of educational programs for special needs students.

A. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

1. Sex: ( ) 1. male ( ) 2. female

2. Age: ( ) 1. below 20 ( ) 3. 30-39 ( ) 5. 50-59
( ) 2. 20-29 ( ) 4. 40-49 ( ) 6. 60 or over

3. Marital status: ( ) 1. single ( ) 5. remarried
( ) 2. married ( ) 6. divorced
( ) 3. separated
( ) 4. divorced

4. Formal education (check highest level)
( ) 1. 8th grade or less ( ) 6. 2-3½ yrs. of college
( ) 2. 9 to 12th grades ( ) 7. Bachelor's degree
( ) 3. completed high school ( ) 8. Master's degree
( ) 4. vocational or business school ( ) 9. Other (Specify)
( ) 5. 2 yrs. or less college _____

5. Major field of college study;
   ( ) 1. Does not apply
   ( ) 2. Agricultural Ed.
   ( ) 3. Guidance Ed.
   ( ) 4. Business & Office
   ( ) 5. Trade & Industrial
   ( ) 6. Health Education
   ( ) 7. Home Ec. Education
   ( ) 8. Distributive Ed.
   ( ) 9. Industrial Arts
   ( ) 10. Other (specify) _____

6. Organizational affiliations (check the type organizations in which you are active):
   ( ) 1. church
   ( ) 2. civic club
   ( ) 3. fraternal
   ( ) 4. social action
   ( ) 5. education
   ( ) 6. vocational education

7. Educational organization affiliations (check any organizations in which you are active):
   ( ) 1. Mississippi Education Association
   ( ) 2. National Education Association
   ( ) 3. Mississippi Teachers Association
   ( ) 4. Mississippi Vocational Association
   ( ) 5. Magnolia State Vocational Association
   ( ) 6. Others (Specify): _____
   _____

8. Size of community you grew up in was:
   ( ) 1. rural
   ( ) 2. small town (under 1,999 population)
   ( ) 3. town (2,000-9,999)
   ( ) 4. city (10,000-24,999)
   ( ) 5. city (25,000 and above)

9. Would you consider both your parents' income while you were growing up to be: (for that time):
   ( ) 1. low
   ( ) 2. low middle
   ( ) 3. middle
   ( ) 4. high middle
   ( ) 5. high

10. Check the amount of <u>both</u> your parents' annual income at the time of your high school graduation:
   ( ) 1. less than $999
   ( ) 2. $1,000-$1999
   ( ) 3. $2000-$2999
   ( ) 4. $3000-$3999
   ( ) 5. $4000-$4999
   ( ) 6. $5000-$5999
   ( ) 7. $6000-$6999
   ( ) 8. $7000-$7999
   ( ) 9. $8000-$8999
   ( ) 10. $9000 or above

11. Length of nonteaching work experience which is directly related to the field in which you are teaching:
   ( ) 1. 1 year or less
   ( ) 2. 2-3 years
   ( ) 3. 4-5 years
   ( ) 4. 6-9 years
   ( ) 5. 10 years or more

12. List your work experience which is directly related to the field in which you are teaching: _____
   _____

13. Teaching experience:
( ) 1. 1 year or less
( ) 2. 2-3 years
( ) 3. 4-5 years
( ) 4. 6-9 years
( ) 5. 10 years or more

14. Check area of teaching experience:
( ) 1. Agriculture
( ) 2. Business & Office
( ) 3. Distributive Ed.
( ) 4. Guidance Ed.
( ) 5. Home Economics
( ) 6. Health Education
( ) 7. Industrial Arts
( ) 8. Trade & Industrial
( ) 9. Other (Specify:_____)

B. PROGRAM INFORMATION

15. Check the vocational service(s) responsible for your program for the special needs students;
( ) 1. Agriculture
( ) 2. Business & Office
( ) 3. Distributive Ed.
( ) 4. Health Education
( ) 5. Home Economics
( ) 6. Industrial Arts
( ) 7. Trade & Industrial
( ) 8. Other (Specify):

16. Total enrollment in your program for the special needs students in the 1968-69 school year was _____.

17. Percentage of dropouts from your program (1968-69) was _____.

18. What are the major reasons for students dropping out of the program?

19. Is a follow-up program carried out for five years on the students in the program for special needs youth? ( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

STUDENT INFORMATION

20. Check type of handicap for which the program was planned:

Type of Handicap	Example
( ) 1. Educationally deprived	- - ranking in the lower 1/3 of their class or slow learners because of such problems as poor reading ability, etc.
( ) 2. Socially disadvantaged	- - those having special problems which affect their educational success, such as alienated youth, loss of parents, etc.
( ) 3. Ethnically disadvantaged	- racially associated problems affecting educational success such as: language, social barriers, etc.
( ) 4. Combination of above	- - specify combination:_____

21. Check the educational level of students in program:
( ) 1. 9th grade
( ) 2. 10th grade
( ) 3. 11th grade
( ) 4. 12th grade
( ) 5. combination of 9th-12th grades
( ) 6. former dropouts
( ) 7. other (describe) _____

22. Check to indicate which statement best describes the procedure used to select students for the program:
( ) 1. Teacher required to take all who are sent.
( ) 2. Teacher takes all who are interested.
( ) 3. Teacher and administrator select from all who are interested.
( ) 4. Teacher selects from those referred by other teachers.
( ) 5. Guidance counselor selects all those who meet qualifying criteria and provides teacher with list from which teacher selects.
( ) 6. Cooperative selection committee composed of vocational teacher, guidance counselor, administrator, and certain teachers make decisions on basis of test, records, and observed student abilities.
( ) 7. Combination of the above (specify combinations)_____
_____
( ) 8. Other (explain) _____
_____

23. Did you have help in selecting the students for the program?
( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

24. If so, from whom did you receive help?
( ) 1. guidance counselor
( ) 2. school administrator
( ) 3. vocational teacher
( ) 4. other teachers
( ) 5. combination of all the above (specify combinations ____
_____.
( ) 6. Other (explain) __
_____

25. On what basis are students selected?
( ) 1. tests
( ) 2. past records
( ) 3. observed student ability
( ) 4. other (explain)
_____
_____

26. If there is more than one section, how is the grouping accomplished?
( ) 1. mental ability
( ) 2. social compatibility
( ) 3. random selection
( ) 4. other (specify)
_____
_____

27. What effect does this program have on the dropout rate at your school?
( ) 1. increases the dropout rate.
( ) 2. decreases the dropout rate.
( ) 3. no apparent influence on the dropout rate.

D. CURRICULUM INFORMATION

28. Is the program curriculum outlined so that it could be adapted to a cimilar program in another school system? If available, please include a copy with this questionnaire.
( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

29. Did you plan the curriculum specifically for this program?
( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

30. This program leads to: ( ) 1. certificate at graduation
( ) 2. diploma at graduation

31. How was subject matter materials made to fit the abilities and needs of the student in the program?
( ) 1. by simplifying ideas from existing materials
( ) 2. by reproducing diagrams, charts, and other materials for special needs students.
( ) 3. by adapting concepts found in existing materials to a specially designed practical exercise.
( ) 4. No special efforts were made.
( ) 5. other (specify):_____
_____

32. Have you been able to obtain a sufficient amount of instructional material for the level at which you are teaching? ( ) 1. yes
( ) 2. no. If yes, from what sources?_____
_____.

33. Check the following materials you use in your teaching:
( ) 1. lesson plans
( ) 2. assignment sheets
( ) 3. information sheets
( ) 4. activity sheets
( ) 5. evaluation (testing)
( ) 6. text,references, workbooks, and resource materials and people
( ) 7. modern instructional material
( ) 8. none of the above
( ) 9. other (specify):_____.

34. Check which best describes the curriculum for your program:
( ) 1. person-oriented
( ) 2. skill-oriented
( ) 3. emphasis on behavioral objectives
( ) 4. emphasis on understanding the individual
( ) 5. combination of the above (specify):_____.
( ) 6. none of the above

E. SELF-APPRAISAL OF PROGRAM

INSTRUCTIONS

Each item on the following form should be rated by placing an "X" in one of the seven columns which indicates your response. On the scale 7 is the highest rating, 4 is the average rating, and 1 denotes the lowest rating.

Item	RATING SCALE (check rating of each question) Superior--Average -- Poor 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
35. Degree of communication sustained between administration and teachers of special needs students.							
36. Degree of communication sustained between faculty members and teachers of special needs students.							
37. Degree of communication sustained between special needs students and teachers of special needs students.							
38. Degree of communication sustained between State Department personnel and local school personnel.							
39. Degree to which other faculty members in the school are involved with special needs students.							
40. Degree to which other vocational teachers are involved with special needs students.							
41. Degree to which guidance personnel are involved in the program.							
42. Degree of professional organization participation of teachers of special needs students.							
43. Degree of professional improvement of teachers of special needs students.							
44. Degree to which facilities are adequate for program for special needs students.							
45. Degree to which equipment is adequate and up-to-date for program.							
46. Degree to which curriculum is adequate and up-to-date.							
47. Degree to which instructional materials are appropriate for special needs students.							
48. Degree to which students have accepted the program.							
49. Degree to which the program has helped students.							
50. Degree to which the program has prevented dropouts.							
51. Degree to which parents of students have accepted the program.							
52. Degree to which students' nonvocational courses are keyed to the program for special needs youth.							

RATING SCALE (check rating of each question)

Item	Superior--Average--Poor 7	6	5	4	3	2	
53. Degree to which special needs students receive directed work experience at places other than school.							
54. Degree to which special needs students participate in the school's extra-curricular activities.							
55. Degree to which desirable personal characteristics and work habits are developed in students.							
56. Degree to which public has accepted the program for special needs youth.							
OVERALL SELF-APPRAISAL (for your programs)							
57. Agriculture							
58. Business and Office							
59. Distributive Education							
60. Health Occupations							
61. Home Economics							
62. Trade and Industrial							

APPENDIX B

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-APPRAISAL OF SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAMS IN MISSISSIPPI

Name_____Title_____
School_____

INTRODUCTION

The State Department of Education, Vocational Division, in cooperation with the Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State University, is undertaking a self-evaluation of vocational programs for disadvantaged (special needs) students throughout the State. The purposes of the research are: (1) to give needed understandings to emerging programs in this area; (2) to identify specific felt strengths and weaknesses in the total program; and (3) to serve as a basis for developing further research on programs for disadvantaged students.

This is the Second Phase of the appraisal of programs for special needs students in the State by the administrators. The First Phase was conducted involving the teachers of special needs students. In the final phase, a sample of schools with programs for special needs students will be selected for the purpose of interviewing teachers of special needs students, special needs students, and administrators. All information will be confidential and individual administrators and schools will NOT be identified in the research.

A. PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. Check the vocational service(s) responsible for your program for the special needs students:
   ( ) 1. Agriculture
   ( ) 2. Business & Office
   ( ) 3. Distributive Ed.
   ( ) 4. Home Economics
   ( ) 5. Trade & Industrial
   ( ) 6. Health Occupations
   ( ) 7. Other (describe)
   _____
   _____

2. Total enrollment in your program for the special students in 1968-69 school year was _____.

3. Percentage of dropouts from your program (1968-69) was _____.

4. What are the major reasons for students dropping out of the program?_____
   _____

5. Is a follow-up program carried out for five years on the students in the program for the special needs youth?
   ( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

B. STUDENT INFORMATION

6. Check type of handicap for which the program was planned:

Type of Handicap		Example
( ) 1. Educationally deprived	-	ranking in the lower 1/3 of their class or slow learners because of such problems as poor reading ability, etc.
( ) 2. Socially disadvantaged	-	those having special problems which affect their educational success, such as alienated youth, loss of parents, etc.
( ) 3. Ethnically disadvantaged	-	racially associated problems affecting educational success such as: language, social barriers, etc.
( ) 4. Combination of above	-	specify combinations_____ _____

7. Check the educational level of students in program:
   ( ) 1. 9th grade
   ( ) 2. 10th grade
   ( ) 3. 11th grade
   ( ) 4. 12th grade
   ( ) 5. combination of 9th-12th grades
   ( ) 6. former dropouts
   ( ) 7. other (describe):_____ _____

8. Check to indicate which statement best describes the procedure used to select students for the program:
   ( ) 1. Teacher required to take all who are sent.
   ( ) 2. Teacher takes all who are interested.
   ( ) 3. Teacher and administrator select from all who are interested.
   ( ) 4. Teacher selects from those referred by other teachers.
   ( ) 5. Guidance counselor selects all those who meet qualifying criteria and provides teacher with list from which teacher selects.
   ( ) 6. Cooperative selection committee composed of vocational teacher, guidance counselor, administrator, and certain teachers make decisions on basis of test, records, and observed student abilities.
   ( ) 7. Combination of the above (specify combination):_____ _____.
   ( ) 8. Other (explain):_____ _____

9. Did you have help in selecting the students for the program?
   ( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no

10. If so, from whom did you receive help?
   ( ) 1. guidance counselor
   ( ) 2. school administrator
   ( ) 3. vocational teacher
   ( ) 4. other teachers
   ( ) 5. combination of the above (specify combinations):____ _____
   ( ) 6. other (explain):__ _____

11. On what basis are students selected:
( ) 1. tests
( ) 2. past records
( ) 3. observed student ability
( ) 4. other (explain): _____

12. If there is more than one section, how is the grouping accomplished?
( ) 1. mental ability
( ) 2. social compatibility
( ) 3. random selection
( ) 4. other (specify):_____

13. What effect does this program have on the dropout rate at your school?
( ) 1. increases the dropout rate.
( ) 2. decreases the dropout rate.
( ) 3. no apparent influence on the dropout rate.

C. CURRICULUM INFORMATION

Is the program curriculum outlines so that they could be adapted to a similar program in another school system? (If available, please include a copy with this questionnaire.) ( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no.

15. Did you plan the curriculum specifically for this program?
( ) 1. yes ( ) 2. no

16. This program leads to: ( ) 1. certificate at graduation
( ) 2. diploma at graduation

17. How was the subject matter materials made to fit the abilities and needs of the student in the program?
( ) 1. by simplifying ideas from existing materials.
( ) 2. by reproducing diagrams, charts, and other materials for special needs students.
( ) 3. by adapting concepts found in existing material to a specially designed practical exercise.
( ) 4. no special efforts were made.
( ) 5. other (specify):_____.

18. Have you been able to obtain a sufficient amount of instructional material for the level at which you are teaching? ( ) 1. yes
( ) 2. no. If yes, from what sources?_____

19. Check the following materials you use in your teaching:
( ) 1. lesson plans
( ) 2. assignment sheets
( ) 3. information sheets
( ) 4. activity sheets
( ) 5. evaluation (testing)
( ) 6. text, references, workbooks, and resource materials and people
( ) 7. modern instructional material
( ) 8. none of the above
( ) 9. other (specify):_____

20. Check which best describes the curriculum for your program:
    ( ) 1. person-oriented
    ( ) 2. skill-oriented
    ( ) 3. emphasis on behavioral objectives
    ( ) 4. emphasis on understanding the individual
    ( ) 5. combination of the above (specify):_____
    ( ) 6. none of the above

D. SELF-APPRAISAL OF PROGRAM

INSTRUCTIONS

Each item in the following form should be rated by placing an "X" in one of seven columns which indicates your response. On the scale, 7 is the highest rating, 4 is the average rating, and 1 denotes the lowest rating.

RATING SCALE (check rating of each question)

Item	Superior--Average--Poor 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
21. Degree of communication sustained between administration and teachers of special needs students.							
22. Degree of communication sustained between faculty members and teachers of special needs students.							
23. Degree of communication sustained between special needs students and teachers of special needs students.							
24. Degree of communication sustained between State Department personnel and local school personnel.							
25. Degree to which other faculty members in the school are involved with special needs students.							
26. Degree to which other vocational teachers in the school are involved with special needs students.							
27. Degree to which guidance personnel are involved in the program.							
28. Degree of professional organization participation of teachers of special needs students.							
29. Degree of professional improvement of teachers of special needs students.							
30. Degree to which facilities are adequate for program for special needs students.							
31. Degree to which equipment is adequate and up-to-date for program.							
32. Degree to which curriculum is adequate and up-to-date.							
33. Degree to which instructional materials are appropriate for special needs students.							
34. Degree to which students have accepted the program.							

RATING SCALE (check rating of each question)

Item	Superior--Average--Poor 7	6	5	4	3	2	1
35. Degree to which the program has helped students.							
36. Degree to which the program has prevented dropouts.							
37. Degree to which parents of students have accepted the program.							
38. Degree to which students' vocational courses are keyed to the program for special needs youth.							
39. Degree to which special needs students receive directed work experience at places other than the school.							
40. Degree to which special needs students participate in school's extracurricular activities.							
41. Degree to which desirable personal characteristics and work habits are developed in students.							
42. Degree to which public has accepted the program for special needs students.							
OVERALL SELF-APPRAISAL (for your program only)							
43. Agriculture							
44. Business and Office							
45. Distributive Education							
46. Health Occupations							
47. Home Economics							
48. Trade and Industrial							